REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 12-16 are pending in the application. Claims 1-9 and 12-16 are rejected. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namma et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,616; hereinafter "Namma") in view of Aoki (U.S. Patent No. 5,983,090; hereinafter "Aoki"). Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namma and Aoki as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Ray et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,067,529; hereinafter "Ray"). Claims 7, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,359,880; hereinafter "Curry") in view Martin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,614,788; hereinafter "Martin"). Claims 8, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit (U.S. Patent No. 6,075,783; hereinafter "Voit") in view of Curry. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit and Curry as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Menon et al. (U.S. Published Application 2001/0022784; hereinafter "Meon"). Applicant submits the arguments below in traversal of the claim rejections.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, and 13 under § 103(a) over Namma in view of Aoki

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 remains patentable because Namma in view of Aoki still fails to teach, suggest or provide motivation for:

(a) receiving a request for an IP address of a *second terminal* from a first terminal;

(b) upon receipt of the request, checking whether an IP address corresponding to the *second terminal* is registered; and

(c) if the IP address is not registered, assigning an IP address to the *second terminal* corresponding to information from an IP address server.

Although Namma discloses a type of proxy server apparatus, there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation for receiving a request for an IP address of a *second terminal*, for example. In response to the applicant's remarks in the April 15, 2005 Amendment, the Examiner explains how Namma discloses a certain communication process which takes place between *a proxy server apparatus 2* and a *server apparatus YAMADA*. Such communication process, however, takes place between *servers*, not between terminals. Therefore, Namma and Aoki fail to teach, suggest or provide motivation for any of the operations (a)-(c) recited in the claim.

Claims 2, 5, and 13, which depend from claim 1, are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1.

Rejection of Claims 3 and 4 under § 103(a) over Namma and Aoki and further in view of Ray

Claims 3 and 4, which depend from claim 1, are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Ray fails to make up for the deficiencies of Namma and Aoki.

Rejection of Claims 7, 15 and 16 under § 103(a) over Curry in view Martin

Claim 7 remains patentable over Curry in view of Martin because Curry fails to teach, suggest or provide motivation for the name server as recited in claim 7. In the Office Action, the

Examiner continues to argue that the DNS 51 supposedly corresponds to the claimed name server. Curry, however, makes no mention of the DNS 51 as having the claimed database for storing IP addresses and the claimed controller which assigns an IP address, *in the context of wireless-to-wireless communication.* Although the Examiner points out that Curry discloses a wireless gateway system 5, this is *not* the DNS 51, but rather, is an entirely different aspect of the system disclosed by Curry.

Further, there is nothing to suggest that the wireless gateway system 5 necessarily teaches, suggests or provides motivation for a name server which comprises:

> a database for storing IP addresses corresponding to telephone numbers of a plurality of terminals, said plurality of terminals including the second wireless terminal; and
>
> a controller which assigns an IP address to the second wireless terminal corresponding to information from the IP address server, if the IP address of the second wireless terminal that is requested by the first wireless terminal using a telephone number is not registered, and registers the assigned IP address in the database.

Therefore, claim 7 is believed to be patentable.

Claim 15 and 16, which depend from claim 7, are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 7.

Rejection of Claims 8, 9 and 12 under § 103(a) over Voit in view of Curry

Claim 8 is believed to be patentable because the Examiner cannot state that the generalized functional descriptions of the Domain Name Server in Voit correspond to the recited claim elements. While the features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. M.P.E.P. § 2114. Here, the claim recites structural elements which are not taught or suggested by Voit.

Thus, claim 8 is believed to be patentable and claims 9 and 12, which depend from claim 8, are believed to be patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Rejection of Claim 14 under § 103(a) over Voit and Curry and further in view of Menon

Claim 14, which depends from claim 8, is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 8, and because Menon fails to make up for the deficiencies of Voit and Curry.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

(Reg. No. 52,432)

for Seok-Won Stuart Lee
Limited Recognition No. L0212

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 15, 2005